

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/631,412

Applicant(s)

KING ET AL.

Examiner

Callie E. Shosho

Art Unit

1714

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Callie E. Shosho.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Lori Rowan.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 06 March 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 17.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Callie Shosho 3/7/03  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

In light of the office action mailed 2/4/02, Paper No. 16, where examiner rejected the present claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, Ms. Rowan argued that the phrase "printed image is substantially retained within the upper protective layer" is not indefinite because one of ordinary skill in the art would understand what is meant by "substantially", namely, that almost all of the image is retained on the upper protective layer. The examiner stated that "substantially" is indefinite because it is not clear what is meant by this term or how much of the image has to be retained on the upper protective layer in order to be considered "substantially" retained. Ms. Rowan noted that Figure 1 and example 3 illustrate to one skilled in the art how the printed image is "substantially" retained given that from the Figure it is seen that most of the ink is in upper protective layer 1. However, examiner stated that from the Figure it is still not clear what is meant by "substantially" or how it is determined or concluded from the Figure that the image is "substantially" retained in the upper protective layer. Examiner suggested, in order to define what is meant by "substantially" retained, submitting a declaration discussing the Figure and example 3 with respect to how it is determined from the example and Figure that the image is substantially retained in the upper protective layer and why from this Figure and example it is concluded that the image is substantially retained in the upper protective layer, i.e. how much of the image is retained on the upper protective layer.